



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/807,731	04/16/2001	Keiko Yamamoto	SAEGU77.001A	6000
20995	7590	06/16/2003	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			PRATT, HELEN F	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1761		

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/807,731	YAMAMOTO ET AL. <i>[Signature]</i>	
Examiner		Art Unit	
Helen F. Pratt		1761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7,10-13 and 16-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 10-13 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 16-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 16-17, 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toshio et al., or Takaaki et al. or Kunihio or Iew et al. and Greff, and further in view of Asako et al. (06-181684) and Yoshio et al. (09-023859) (from applicants disclosure form).

The claims are rejected for the reasons of record and for these further reasons. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to require that the composition is a vegetable juice containing the claimed puree. Upon further consideration, Asako discloses process of treating vegetables with asorbic acid. Yoshio et al. disclose that it is known to make a beverage (juice) containing carrot juice and pulp. Claim 1 differs from the reference in the use of an added unheated green vegetable puree containing an acid and having a pH of 2.7 to 4.1. As it is known to treat vegetables with an acid to prevent discoloration, it would have been obvious to treat the carrot material of Yoshio et al. for the same function of preventing discoloration. The pH is seen to have been within 2.7 to 4.1 with the addition of acid in the composition because on page 9 of the reference discloses pH values within the claimed range. The carrot juice is seen to contain pulp, because the abstract says that "food fibers" are contained in the composition, and food

fiber is obtained from the pulp of the vegetable. The limitation that the composition is now a vegetable juice which contains the unheated green vegetable puree without catalase activity is seen to be encompassed by the combined references which show a vegetable drink containing pulp, i. e. no weight is given to a construction of the limitation that the puree is a separate component than that found in vegetable juice as in the process claims. Therefore, it would have been obvious to make a composition containing an acidified puree in the composition of the primary references because no patentable distinction is seen in ground up vegetable products which make a juice and in a juice product containing a puree, because the ingredients are the same.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10-13 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Helen F. Pratt at telephone number 703-308-1978.

Hp 6-12-03

H. Pratt
HELEN PRATT
PRIMARY EXAMINER